

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected claim 13 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The limitation of "a bonusing event" is not clearly defined in the specification. The specification appears to be silent with respect to what constitutes "a bonusing event". The specification appears to only state that "a or the" "bonusing event" occurs because of a trigger event.

In the specification the bonusing event is described as having a payout that can be paid by the casino or by the gaming device. Page 9 of specification. The invention allows for the gaming machine to have a mechanism to allow a player to operate the bonusing event from any of the gaming machines linked to the interactive sign. The bonusing event can be played on a separate gaming machine. Page 10 of the specification. A user can be chosen for a bonusing event based on the number of coins placed in an individual gaming machine or based on the total coins placed in linked gaming machines. A user can further be chosen for a bonusing event once a user has won a particular prize on a gaming machine. Page 10 of the specification.

The specification on page 10 states that the bonusing event can be a wheel which has various monetary denominations around it. A further bonusing event is described as an LCD Screen where a player plays against a Casino dealer. Page 11 describes the bonusing event as a ferris wheel that unloads coins.

Page 13 of the specification states that if a user gets 3 bonus event symbols, or other particular combination, the user is directed to play the bonusing event on the interactive sign.

Therefore claim 13 does comply with the written description requirement.

The Examiner has rejected claim 13 as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The limitation of “wherein players playing said linked gaming machines who enter said bonusing event compete against each other at said bonusing event” is non-enabled by the specification. The specification does not explain how the players would compete against each other. The specification appears to be enabling only for competition between a player on the gaming machine and the interactive sign.

The present invention teaches that multiple gaming machines are linked to an interactive sign. Each gaming device has a mechanism allowing a player to operate the bonusing event from any of the gaming machines linked to the interactive sign. The present invention allows multiple players playing the linked gaming machine to enter the bonusing event and compete against each other. One of the examples of the bonusing event is a card game versus a casino dealer as shown in Figure 3. This is an example which teaches multiple players competing against each other and against a dealer. Further, the present invention teaches that the interactive sign can be a game board such as monopoly. Games can be any conventional game which a player plays according to game rules. When a player reaches the game board, they can either play against a computer or against other persons who have reached the bonusing event through other linked gaming machines. The interactive sign can then roll dice randomly on the screen moving the player around the board.

Based on this description found in the specification, which shows how the players compete against each other in the bonusing event on the interactive sign, claim 13 satisfies the enablement requirement.

The Examiner has rejected claim 13 as being anticipated or obvious over Stefan '277. Stefan discloses and teaches a gaming system where players compete against each other for the top prize; i.e., the highest ranked player wins the bonus money. As described by Stephan, players play linked gaming machines as fast as they can to achieve the highest payout per machine, this is the player competing against each other and portions of their bets pool the bonus payout. The gaming machines are disclosed as being linked together via a central computer. The interactive sign for Stephan is the portion of the video display at each gaming machine that shows the amount of the bonus. Because this is common to all gaming machines it is deemed to be an interactive sign, because the players are competing for winning the jackpot from their respective machines. Also, disclosed as a competition among players is the players trying to achieve the highest ranking poker hand. The player that achieves the highest rank in either scenario described above wins the bonus payout. Furthermore, it would be obvious to have the bonus payout shown on one main display because this would permit visitors to see as well as the players the bonus payout accumulate during the competition time period and then see the winning player of the bonus payout.

Amended claim 13 requires that the players compete in the bonusing event on the interactive sign. Stefan teaches as stated by the Examiner that the players play the casino game and the highest total wins a prize. The game that is played is played on

the gaming machine and not on the interactive sign. The only thing the interactive sign shows is the amount of money to be won. There is no interaction between the interactive sign and the gaming machines. Therefore claim 13 is not anticipated or obvious over Stephan.

The Examiner has rejected claim 13 as being obvious over Acres '567 and Stephan '277.

The Examiner states that Acres discloses, teaches and suggests a plurality of gaming machines (10) linked together, see fig. 2, connected to an interactive sign (42). As disclosed a bonusing computer (38) and animation computer (40) that can be considered part of the interactive sign as well. When a triggering event occurs a signal is sent through the network of gaming machines. The trigger event is the total number of coins played by the player. The triggering event initiates a secondary game and a tertiary game, together deemed the bonus event, and half of this bonus event is common to the group of gaming machines; while the tertiary game is available to those players to play the largest amount of coins, thus there is competition between the players to play in order to reach the tertiary and win the bonus amounts given in both the secondary game and the tertiary. It is disclosed that the triggering event is the amount of coins played; however, it is silent as to what the games, the bonus event, constitute. However, in an analogous device, Stefan, teaches and suggests that the bonus event can be a competition among players to see who can play fastest. The players are ranked by the number of coins played per unit time and the player that plays the largest amount of total coins is the player with the highest rank and wins the

bonus payout. Therefore, one skilled in the art would find it obvious to incorporate two disclosures and teachings together to form one linked gaming system which allows players to compete to win the bonus in order to a common secondary game, a part of the bonus event, shared with adjoining machines so that the element of competition among players is given and the enjoyment of spectators is enhanced to which is what Acres disclosed invention is trying to solve.

Stefan relates to a plurality of gaming machines linked together and controlled by a central computer. A bonus system is incorporated into the play of the gaming machines and the central computer tracks the bonus system activity and makes the appropriate payouts. A portion of the coins wagered are allocated to a bonus payout. Each player plays his gaming machines for a fixed time period and the player with the highest payout during the time period wins the bonus jackpot.

Acres solely teaches that with a series of linked gaming machines with a triggering event a single player is sent to a screen for playing a secondary game such as a wheel of fortune. There is nothing taught in either Stefan or Acres to play a secondary bonusing event on an interactive screen and for players to compete on the interactive screen. Therefore claim 13 is not obvious over Acres in view of Stefan.

"EXPRESS MAIL" Mailing Label No. EV 309317085 US

Date of Deposit: February 16, 2005

I hereby certify that this paper (and any document(s) attached herewith)
Are being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail
Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10 on the
date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for
for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on
February 16, 2005

Signature: Debbie Broderick

Name: Debbie Broderick

Respectfully submitted,



Philip M. Weiss
Reg. No. 34,751
Attorney for Applicant
Weiss & Weiss
300 Old Country Rd.,
Ste. 251
Mineola, NY 11501
(516) 739-1500